UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
33rd meeting
held on
Monday, 11 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 33rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. MROZIEWICZ (Poland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of an action on draft resolutions under all disarmament agenda items

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-61730 7295V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/46/PV.33
19 November 1991

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 47 TO 65 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF AND ACTION ON DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AGENDA ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/46/L.23: Samoa;

A/C.1/46/L.28: Chile and Singapore;

A/C.1/46/L.24: Egypt;

A/C.1/46/L.9: Republic of Korea;

A/C.1/46/L.36: Republic of Korea and Samoa;

A/C.1/46/L.17: Republic of Korea;

A/C.1/46/L.1: Republic of Korea;

A/C.1/46/L.34: Cyprus;

A/C.1/46/L.27: Austria.

The CHAIRMAN: As delegations will recall, on Friday I indicated that a number of draft resolutions under clusters 3, 4 and 5 would be acted upon today. Following further consultations and because of ongoing negotiations, I now wish to inform delegations that today we shall take action on the following draft resolutions:

In cluster 3: A/C.1/46/L.4, A/C.1/46/L.19, A/C.1/46/L.20 and A/C.1/46/L.28;

In cluster 4: A/C.1/46/L.30;

In cluster 5: A/C.1/46/L.16 and A/C.1/46/L.36.

I call on the representative of Sweden, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.7/Rev.1, concerning the study (A/46/364) on charting potential uses of resources allocated to military activities for civilian endeavours to protect the environment. The draft resolution is sponsored by Brazil, the host country for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992, by Bolivia, Indonesia, and by my own country, Sweden. My delegation would welcome more countries becoming sponsors of the draft resolution; indeed, many countries have expressed a wish to do that.

The study was presented in Geneva in August 1991 to the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development by the Chairperson of the group of experts which carried out the study, Ambassador Maj Britt Theorin.

The draft resolution is a purely procedural one.

In its preamble, the desirability of benefiting from progress in disarmament within the endeavours to protect the environment is noted. Let me add that the progress achieved in the field of disarmament gives grounds for hope that realistic steps can be taken in this context.

In the operative part of the draft resolution, it is proposed that the General Assembly take note of the report of the Secretary-General. Further, the Secretary-General is requested to submit the report to the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, which will take place in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in June 1992. The Secretary-General is also requested to arrange for the reproduction of the

(Mr. Hyltenius, Sweden)

study and to distribute it widely. Finally, the study is commended to the attention of all Member States.

It is the hope of the sponsors that this draft resolution will be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolutions listed in cluster 3.

I shall call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote before the voting.

Mr. STELZER (Austria): I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19.

Over the years, by voting in favour of the respective resolutions entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze", Austria has expressed its agreement with the basic ideas and concepts of the so-called freeze.

In the explanation of its vote on last year's resolution, Austria emphasized that, with regard to recent developments in the fields of arms control and disarmament, the freeze should neither prevent nor impede the reduction of the stockpiles of nuclear arms or the complete elimination of nuclear weapons. Thus, the concept of a nuclear-arms freeze, which, as we understood it, was to complement disarmament and arms-control achievements, was a relevant one.

Recent trends, which have led to an improvement in the global security environment, have facilitated new developments in the field of nuclear-arms control and, furthermore, have brought about first steps towards nuclear disarmament. This is indeed recognized in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, which refers to recent achievements such as the START Treaty and unilateral disarmament steps by the United States, subsequently reciprocated by the Soviet Union.

Austria recognizes those developments and achievements as signals for the reversal of the nuclear-arms race. The concept of a freeze, which we had considered relevant in the previous years, thus has been overtaken by the dynamics of history. That is why Austria will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19.

Mr. KENYON (United Kingdom): There is a new situation this year in that only one draft resolution is to be considered under the two agenda items 51 and 53.

(Mr. Kenyon, United Kingdom)

I should like to explain that the United Kingdom will abstain on the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4. This vote does not mean a change in my Government's policy on nuclear testing. The United Kingdom Government believes that for the foreseeable future the security of the United Kingdom will depend on deterrence based in part on the possession of nuclear weapons. Hence, there is a continuing requirement to ensure that our nuclear weapons remain safe, effective and up to date. For this purpose it will also continue to be necessary for us to conduct some underground nuclear tests.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation wishes to explain the vote it will cast on the draft resolution on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty.

France remains convinced that the prohibition of nuclear tests can only be the result, and not the precondition, of the process of nuclear disarmament. It cannot have priority over a substantial reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the two major Powers. The fact that a reduction has begun shows that my delegation's position is well founded.

As my delegation recalled in the general debate, in order to meet its legitimate security needs and preserve its independence and vital interests, France has chosen a strategy of deterrence based on the possession of its own nuclear forces, kept at a strict level of adequacy. In order to maintain the credibility of its means of defence, France has no choice but to continue its tests, within the framework of a strictly limited programme and at a pace and in conditions dictated by the relevant technology. Indeed, this technology has made possible a constant decrease in the number of France's tests.

My country is pleased at the recent progress in the process of reducing the nuclear overarmament of the two major Powers. It notes with particular

(Mr. Errera, France)

satisfaction that the two Powers have begun to move towards the minimal deterrence which from the very beginning has been at the heart of French doctrine.

France recently recalled that it is ready to participate at the right time in the process of nuclear disarmament. However, we cannot but note the persistence of vast disparities between its own means of defence, which are limited, and the nuclear arsenal of considerable magnitude that still exists on the European continent. France cannot disregard the persistence of such a disporportion or the reality of such capacities without endangering its own security and the stability of the European continent.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 has 45 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of New Zealand at the 25th meeting of the First Committee on 4 November 1991. The sponsors are: Afghanistan, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Myanmar, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, Ukraine, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Yugoslavia and Zaire.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: France, United States of America

Abstaining: China, Israel, Marshall Islands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 was adopted by 127 votes to 2, with 4 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently the delegations of Benin, Burundi, Gabon, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Rwanda and Uganda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth special session of the General Assembly: nuclear-arms freeze". I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19 has seven sponsors and was introduced by the representative of India at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors reads as follows: Afghanistan, Bolivia, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Myanmar and the Sudan.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, China, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Marshall Islands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19 was adopted by 95 votes to 18, with 21 abstentions.*

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20, entitled "Review and implementation of the concluding document of the twelfth sepcial session of the General Assembly: Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20 has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of India at the 31st meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors reads as follows: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

---

* Subsequently, the delegations of Benin, Gabon, Rwanda and Uganda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20 was adopted by 96 votes to 17, with 20 abstentions.*

The PRESIDENT: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

---

* Subsequently, the delegations of Benin, Gabon, Rwanda and Uganda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour; the delegation of Germany advised that it had intended to vote against.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28 has 15 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Bolivia, Chile, Costa Rica, India, Indonesia, Mexico, Nigeria, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Turkey

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28 was adopted by 96 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.*

---

* Subsequently, the delegations of Gabon, Rwanda and Uganda advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position or votes.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): While the Committee has just adopted draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, I should like to make it clear that, as France is not a party to the Moscow Treaty of 1963, it deliberately did not take part in the vote.

Mr. RIDER (New Zealand): I have asked to speak in order to explain New Zealand's vote on two draft resolutions which the Committee has just adopted - that is draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, "Nuclear-arms freeze", and draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water".

I shall begin with draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19. At a time when the numbers of nuclear weapons were steadily increasing, the concept of a nuclear-arms freeze had some validity. A freeze would have provided a breathing space, an opportunity for the nuclear-weapon States to take stock and, we all hoped, come to the realization that nuclear arsenals far exceeded what was realistically necessary to guarantee security.

That idea is now a reality. As draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19 acknowledges, we are witnessing what could be the reversal of the nuclear-arms race. The result, in our view, is that a nuclear-arms freeze is an idea whose time has come and gone. Many of the key elements of a freeze are covered in other resolutions - on nuclear testing and on a ban on the production of fissionable material, for example. There are also more direct ways to address vertical proliferation.

New Zealand considers that the efforts of the Committee would be better directed towards practical, realistic security-enhancing measures than towards concepts like a nuclear-arms freeze, which have been overtaken by events. Accordingly, we abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19.

I turn now to the second draft resolution - contained in document A/C.1/46/L.28 - on the amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water. As all delegations are aware, New Zealand is strongly committed to the conclusion of a comprehensive

(Mr. Rider, New Zealand)

test-ban treaty, which would ban nuclear testing in all environments for all time. That commitment lies behind our sponsoring of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4, on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, which was just adopted by the Committee. I should like to take this opportunity to thank all delegations which supported that draft resolution.

New Zealand considers that this year's partial test-ban Treaty Amendment Conference provided a valuable opportunity for a broad-ranging discussion of test-ban issues, a discussion in which all States parties to the partial test-ban Treaty were able to participate on an equal footing. We were accordingly pleased to support that Conference's decision that the President should conduct consultations with a view to achieving progress and resuming the work of the Conference at an appropriate time. New Zealand has participated constructively in those consultations.

We should have liked to be similarly able to support a draft resolution on this subject. A straightforward procedural text, noting the decision taken by States parties at the Conference would, in our view, have been the most appropriate way for the General Assembly to offer its support for the ongoing consultations of Foreign Minister Alatas.

Paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, however, goes beyond what States parties have agreed with regard to the resumption of the work of the Conference. The draft resolution also reiterates aspects of earlier draft resolutions which New Zealand was not able to support.

For those reasons, New Zealand reluctantly had to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28.

Mr. ERRERA (France) (interpretation from French): As I did last year, I should like to state France's reasons for its negative vote on a draft resolution on a nuclear-arms freeze - this year in document A/C.1/46/L.19.

(Mr. Rider, New Zealand)

Our objections to this draft resolution - which have been set forth on many occasions - concern the very concept of the freeze.

First, a freeze would, by definition, lead to locking in existing situations and consequently to the imbalances which those situations could engender, as well as the resultant risks to the security of the States concerned.

On the other hand, it is clear that a freeze would be tantamount to giving a lasting advantage to any State that greatly increased its arsenals, and that would operate to the detriment of States which had limited their efforts.

Moreover, the establishment of effective machinery to verify an agreement on freezing armaments would require negotiations that would be just as long and difficult as those relating to an arms-reduction agreement.

Finally, to the extent that it could benefit a certain Power, a freeze could considerably reduce that Power's interest in negotiations, and therefore its will seriously to negotiate an arms-reduction agreement.

Therefore, the progress towards the reduction of nuclear overarmament - our real objective - can in no way be promoted by declarations calling for a freeze. The path leading to that reduction is the one which initially would require the continuation of negotiations between the two major Powers. My delegation once again expresses its satisfaction that they have begun to focus on minimal deterrence, which is at the heart of our doctrine.

France hopes that, in the light of the developments in the international situation, the sponsors of this draft resolution will in the future recognize the validity of these arguments.

Mr. COLLINS (Ireland): I have asked to speak in order to explain Ireland's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, on a nuclear-arms freeze, and draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, on the amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water. Ireland abstained on both draft resolutions.

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

As regards the draft resolution on a nuclear-arms freeze (A/C.1/46/L.19), my delegation supports the objective set out therein: that is, an end to the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons. Our position on this point is very clear. However, we are no longer convinced that the method proposed in the draft resolution for achieving this objective is the most likely to be successful.

We have seen great strides in unilateral and bilateral arms reductions in the past year. There are good prospects of further reductions of this sort. In addition, the multilateral approach in the Conference on Disarmament is beginning to bear fruit in the field of chemical weapons. My delegation welcomes these developments.

In the new climate of international relations which has replaced the cold war, we feel that a combination of unilateral, bilateral and multilateral approaches is most likely to bring progress in the field of nuclear disarmament. In that context we feel that the concept of a freeze and the draft resolution on the subject need to be re-examined. My delegation, therefore, while supporting some of the underlying concepts in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.9, regrets that, for the reasons stated, it could not vote in favour of it.

As regards the draft resolution in document A/C.1/46/L.28, on the Amendment Conference of the Parties to the partial test-ban Treaty, my delegation regrets that it was unable to vote in favour of the text. Ireland supported the decision, at the conclusion of the Amendment Conference last January, which is reflected in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

(Mr. Collins, Ireland)

We did so as an expression of our political support for the efforts to continue to find ways to reach agreement on an end to nuclear testing.

My delegation understood and supported the ongoing consultations of the President of the Amendment Conference, and since these consultations are now taking place we saw no need for, or much point in, any resolution other than a procedural resolution on this subject until such time as the President's consultations have been completed. My delegation therefore abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28.

Mr. DONOWAKI (Japan): I wish to explain Japan's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.4, A/C.1/46/L.28 and A/C.1/46/L.19.

With respect to resolution A/C.1/46/L.4, which has just been adopted, Japan highly appreciates this year's draft resolution and wishes to express great appreciation for the efforts made by New Zealand, Australia and Mexico in particular, which resulted in the merger of the two draft resolutions which used to be submitted separately in previous years. This new unified draft resolution should be a reflection of the shared awareness of the need to take into account the remarkable progress that has been achieved recently in the field of nuclear disarmament.

On the other hand, Japan wishes to reiterate on this occasion its conviction that the progress towards a nuclear-test ban should be made in a manner that would not jeopardize the security of individual States or international peace and security, in which nuclear deterrence continues to play an important role. Japan believes that a step-by-step approach is the best and surest way to achieve a comprehensive test ban and is convinced that the Conference on Disarmament provides the best avenue for reaching our shared common goal. Japan therefore welcomes the re-establishment this year of the

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

Ad Hoc Committee on a nuclear-test ban in the Conference on Disarmament, and strongly hopes that it will be re-established at the beginning of the 1992 session of the Conference on Disarmament under the same mandate as this year, in order to pursue substantive work on specific and interrelated test-ban issues, including structure and scope, as well as verification and compliance.

With respect to resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, Japan regarded the partial test-ban Treaty Amendment Conference as providing another opportunity to discuss various ways to achieve a comprehensive test ban and is glad that nuclear and non-nuclear States could together exchange their views at this Conference. However, Japan is of the view that the best way to carry out discussions on a comprehensive test ban is at the Conference on Disarmament, of which all nuclear-weapon States are members. Japan is of the view that some of the operative paragraphs in this draft resolution do not reflect the actual situation after the Amendment Conference of January, and therefore the draft resolution does not appear to be realistic.

As to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, on a nuclear freeze, over the years Japan has been making consistent efforts in pursuit of nuclear disarmament at the United Nations and at various other international forums, with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons. Also, Japan wholeheartedly welcomes the recent remarkable progress being made in the field of nuclear disarmament between the United States and the Soviet Union.

On the other hand, while pursuing the road towards the realization of nuclear disarmament, Japan considers that we should not lose sight of the present world situation where nuclear deterrence continues to play an important role in maintaining the security of the world.

(Mr. Donowaki, Japan)

It is for this reason that Japan has doubts about the practicability or meaningfulness of the proposal on a nuclear-arms freeze, on which the vote was taken. A freeze on nuclear arms means the preservation of a real or perceived nuclear superiority of one side over the other, unless it is backed up by a reliable and well-prepared arrangement that would ensure a balanced reduction in nuclear arms. Therefore, freezing of nuclear arms cannot by itself be a contributing factor for international peace and stability. Furthermore, as to the question of verification referred to in the draft resolution, my delegation understands that in the case of a nuclear-arms freeze, verification is extremely difficult. Of course, a mere declaration of a nuclear freeze, without effective means of verification, would not contribute to the peace and security of the world.

Mr. STELZER (Austria): Austria would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28. I will also refer briefly to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4.

In the face of a historic chance to halt the build-up of nuclear armaments and to reverse the trend towards real reductions of the nuclear armouries, we must not neglect other important aspects of the nuclear-arms debate. Above all, quantitative reductions will have to be complemented by a halt in the qualitative nuclear-arms race, that is, the development of new, more sophisticated and more destructive systems of nuclear weapons. While my Government welcomes unilateral moratoriums, Austria believes that the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is required to stop all nuclear testing effectively.

Austria welcomes the merger of the traditional resolutions on nuclear testing in this year's draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4. We are co-sponsoring

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

this text, which we see as a reflection of a growing consensus in the First Committee on the issue of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Since the nuclear issue is of immediate concern to all nations, to the "haves" as well as to the "have-nots", we do hope that the emphasized concern, expressed in this single text, will have a positive impact on those countries still opposing a comprehensive test-ban treaty on grounds of national-security interests. A comprehensive test-ban Treaty, as another important step towards the total elimination of all nuclear weapons, will contribute to diminishing fears and suspicions and thus enhance the stability and, consequently, the security of all nations.

Although there is a shared conviction of the need to come to a comprehensive test-ban treaty soon, delegations differ on how to achieve such a treaty. Austria supports the proposal in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 that negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty should be referred to the Conference on Disarmament. We do recognize, however, that there may be other approaches, which could bring about an agreement on a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. Stelzer, Austria)

Unfortunately, no consensus could be reached on a final document of the Amendment Conference of the partial test-ban Treaty, held last January. A final text introduced by the President of the Conference was not acceptable to all delegations. It would have defined major elements for the informal continuation of the Conference on the basis of informal consultations. It would also have referred some of the unresolved questions to the Conference on Disarmament. Finally a vote was taken on a text that not only suggested further informal consultations, but also envisaged a formal continuation of the process. This, unfortunately, seems difficult given the existing political stalemate on the issue.

Apart from reiterating points which Austria was unable to support in previous years, draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28 reissues the foregoing provision in its paragraph 2. Hence, Austria regretfully had to abstain in the vote.

Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.19 and A/C.1/46/L.28.

With reference to L.19, I should like to recall that the Soviet delegation has unfailingly supported resolutions on a nuclear arms freeze over many years. We are convinced that that approach has proved itself. In the previous conditions of global nuclear confrontation and the absence of large-scale measures to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons, we regarded the nuclear arms freeze as an effective first step towards curtailing the quantitative and qualitative build-up of nuclear weapons. However, in recent years the situation has changed. We have witnessed fundamental improvements in the overall nature of international relations which have most directly affected the nuclear disarmament field.

(Mr. Krasulin, USSR)

It has been pointed out repeatedly at the present session that there is now scope for a radical curtailment of the nuclear arms race. In other words, there has been a turn towards a nuclear disarmament race. The credit for that belongs not only to the two biggest nuclear Powers but to the entire world community whose efforts have succeeded in creating a favourable climate for developing the present positive trends. We believe that a constructive role has been played in this by resolutions adopted in the United Nations on a nuclear arms freeze. However, it seems to us that in the conditions of developing the process of radical reduction and elimination of nuclear weapons, the question of freezing these weapons has lost its urgency, and ceases to correspond to present-day realities. For this reason, the Soviet delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19.

In explanation of our vote on A/C.1/46/L.28 on the "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water", we should like to point out that, as has been stated on a number of occasions, the Soviet Union is prepared to make use of every opportunity to achieve a total ban on nuclear weapons tests. At the present stage in moving to a new phase of disarmament, exceptionally favourable conditions are emerging for a breakthrough in this area.

The unilateral moratorium declared by the Soviet Union and the initiatives of a number of other States, including Sweden, are helping us to make progress towards achieving the stated goal. Convening the Amendment Conference of States Parties to the 1963 Treaty made it possible to raise the question of a comprehensive nuclear test ban and to focus the attention of the world community upon it. It is very important that this process has encouraged the development of specific ideas and proposals in the field of

(Mr. Krasulin, USSR)

test ban verification. We favour the continuation of the Chairman's consultations within the Conference mandate entrusted to him and of resuming the Conference at an appropriate time, as provided for by the Conference decision. We consider that it is essential to seek solutions acceptable to all Parties to the 1963 Treaty.

Guided by these considerations, the Soviet delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28.

Mr. SHAH (India): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4.

My delegation is happy that this year we have only one draft resolution on the subject of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, and we compliment the sponsors for having made this possible.

The objective of achieving a ban on all nuclear-weapons tests is a long-standing priority issue for us. The objective is clearly reiterated in the preamble to the 1963 partial test-ban Treaty. Our vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 is without prejudice to our well-known position on the scope of a comprehensive test-ban treaty to be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament, as visualized in the preamble to the partial test-ban Treaty.

India had the honour to chair the 1991 Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban. Despite every effort on our part and the cooperation of many delegations, the lack of an adequate negotiating mandate has prevented the achievement of any significant progress towards achieving our goal. We therefore commend the call made in the draft resolution for the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee in 1992 with an adequate negotiating mandate. Meanwhile, my delegation invites all nuclear-weapon States to replicate unreservedly the unilateral moratorium on nuclear-weapons tests announced by the USSR.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States wishes to explain its negative votes on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4, entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", and on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water".

United States policy on nuclear testing is, we should think, by now well known to the members of the Committee. It has been elaborated on numerous occasions, most recently in the Committee on Thursday, 7 November, when we also dealt with some continuing misconceptions regarding this issue.

The United States recognizes that draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 contains some improvements as compared to previous resolutions on this issue. Regrettably, however, none of these improvements affects the basic thrust of the draft resolution, which remains contrary to United States policy. To cite just one example, the draft resolution urges an early and unconditional discontinuance of all nuclear tests - a step that the United States sees as a long-term objective to be viewed in the context of certain essential conditions.

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

Under the circumstances, the United States could not but vote against this draft resolution.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, the United States finds it contrary not only to its policy on nuclear testing, but also to its position on the partial test-ban Treaty Amendment Conference. That Conference was convened by the depositories in accordance with article II of the partial test-ban Treaty and took place from 7 to 18 January 1991. The United States and the other two depositories have thus fulfilled their obligation under that article.

As it stated at the end of the Conference, the United States considers the Amendment Conference terminated. It will not participate in, or recognize, any further action concerning the Conference that other parties to the Treaty may pursue on their own.

The United States regards the partial test-ban Treaty as a highly valuable arms-control instrument, the integrity of which must not be placed at risk. We deeply regret continued attempts to use it as a political football.

Those are the basic reasons for the negative vote the United States cast on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28.

Mr. DEYANOV (Bulgaria): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on two draft resolutions just adopted by the First Committee: draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, on a nuclear-arms freeze, and draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20, on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons.

In principle Bulgaria takes a positive view of the basic objective behind the concept of a nuclear-arms freeze, intended to fix the existing situation with a view to providing time to negotiate appropriate reductions of nuclear arsenals in such a way that the negotiated agreements would not run too great

(Mr. Devanov, Bulgaria)

a risk of being overtaken by the pace of the arms race. We believe that such a freeze could have been a viable and valuable option indeed in the past, when the nuclear-arms race was going on unabated.

At present, however, the situation seems to have changed completely. Nuclear disarmament has become part of our life. Significant progress in reducing the nuclear arsenals of the two leading nuclear Powers has been made during the past several years. It may suffice to mention only the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles (INF Treaty), the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and the most recent unilateral steps by the United States of America and the USSR to withdraw non-strategic nuclear weapons on a global scale. These are elements of a completely new situation in the nuclear field, when mankind has begun a long process aimed at the elimination of all nuclear weapons everywhere.

In such circumstances, calling for a nuclear-arms freeze might, in practice, be somewhat misleading or even imply a reversal of the existing momentum in nuclear disarmament, which would be highly undesirable. It is difficult for us to reconcile the conviction expressed in the draft resolution on a nuclear-arms freeze that the current international situation is most conducive to nuclear disarmament with a call to freeze the nuclear status quo.

For those reasons my delegation decided to change the vote it cast last year on a similar draft resolution. We are glad to observe that a number of other delegations acted in the same manner in the new situation.

On the draft resolution dealing with the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons, the delegation of Bulgaria again abstained, as it did on a similar draft resolution at last year's session. We believe that the new situation offers new opportunites for change in long-held perceptions on

(Mr. Deyanov, Bulgaria)

the use of nuclear weapons, but we are not quite sure that the draft resolution in document A/C.1/46/L.20 adequately reflects the most promising avenues for progress in this area. That is why my delegation abstained on that draft resolution.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): My delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.19, "Nuclear-arms freeze", and A/C.1/46/L.28, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water".

Sweden abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19 since it considers that the freeze concept has become obsolete in view of the important developments in the field of bilateral disarmament, with considerable reductions in the nuclear arsenals.

Sweden also abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28 because in its view it is up to the States parties to the partial test-ban Treaty to agree on the necessary measures with regard to a possible amendment of the Treaty. We would therefore have preferred to see a draft resolution that limited itself to addressing the ongoing consultations carried out by Foreign Minister Alatas of Indonesia, President of the Amendment Conference, in January this year. Sweden welcomed these consultations and took an active part in them. We hope that they will be brought to a successful conclusion.

The Swedish delegation views with sympathy the aim of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, which is to promote a positive development of the test-ban issue. The position of Sweden on a nuclear-test ban is well known. Sweden has consistently advocated negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty. Sweden has co-sponsored relevant draft resolutions in the First Committee and the General Assembly and has also presented concrete treaty drafts to the Conference on Disarmament, the latest one in July this year.

Mr. LIU Jieyi (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation wishes to make a few remarks concerning its position of principle on the issue of a nuclear-test ban.

China understands the urgent desire of a vast number of non-nuclear-weapon States for the early attainment of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. Adopting a restrained and prudent attitude towards nuclear testing, China has conducted a very limited number of nuclear tests, and stopped nuclear testing in the atmosphere in 1981. China has also constructively participated in the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. From May to June this year China participated in part of the second technical test relating to the global exchange and analysis of seismic data organized by the Ad Hoc Group of Scientific Experts of the Conference on Disarmament.

We believe that the cessation of nuclear testing by all States should be effected in the framework of an effective nuclear-disarmament process. On such issues as the cessation of nuclear testing and nuclear disarmament, countries with the largest nuclear arsenals have special responsibilities and should take the lead in halting the testing, production and deployment of nuclear weapons and drastically reduce their nuclear arsenals so as to create conditions for the realization of a comprehensive nuclear-test ban. We have taken note of the actions they have taken in the field of nuclear disarmament. However, they still have a long way to go in discharging their special responsibilities and obligations. China is prepared to work with other countries in exploring the ways to promote complete nuclear disarmament, including a comprehensive nuclear-test ban.

I shall now make a few comments on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20.

(Mr. Liu Jieyi, China)

The Chinese delegation has just voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". I am speaking now in order to reiterate the position of principle of the Chinese Government on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons. The Chinese Government has all along stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and has, since the first day of its possession of nuclear weapons, undertaken not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time or under any circumstances.

(Mr. Liu Jieyi, China)

China has also undertaken not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones at any time or under any circumstances. We hope that all the other nuclear-weapon States can make the same commitment unconditionally.

China has also called for the signing of a corresponding international agreement on this basis which will provide a forceful impetus to the process of nuclear disarmament. We hope that China's constructive initiative will receive a positive response.

Based on the above-mentioned position of principle, the Chinese delegation is in favour of the main thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20 on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and at the same time wishes to point out that certain elements of the draft resolution and the annexed text of the draft convention need to be improved.

Mr. FULE (Czechoslovakia): On behalf of Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia, let me explain our voting on two draft resolutions which were adopted just a moment ago: A/C.1/46/L.19, "Nuclear-arms freeze", and A/C.1/46/L.20, "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons".

The three countries - Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia - strongly support a realistic and most effective approach in various fields of disarmament. During recent months, they have witnessed an impressive breakthrough in nuclear disarmament as a result of the outstanding initiatives taken by President Bush and President Gorbachev. Consequently, it is time for real and verified nuclear disarmament. Taking into account the fact that the United States and the USSR are considerably reducing their nuclear arsenals, the idea of a nuclear-arms freeze is simply outdated. That is why Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia decided to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.19, entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze".

(Mr. Fule, Czechoslovakia)

As for draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20, "Convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons", the three would like to reiterate their consistent support for and commitment to the principle of the non-use of nuclear weapons. They consider it an essential, important element, together with a strong non-proliferation regime, for global and regional security. At the same time, they advocate pragmatic and realistic approaches and measures in this field.

At this juncture, the necessary political and legal requirements are not present for a possible codification of the principle of the non-use of nuclear weapons. For this reason the delegations of Hungary, Poland and Czechoslovakia abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20.

Mr. WAGENMAKERS (Netherlands): I wish to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/46/L.4 and A/C.1/46/L.28.

During last year's session of the General Assembly my delegation gave a detailed explanation of vote on the issue of nuclear testing and on the subject of a special conference with the aim of amending the partial test-ban Treaty. The Netherlands position has not changed since then. We can again confirm our commitment to a comprehensive test ban as a long-term goal, framed in the perspective of the broader context of the process of disarmament and nuclear disarmament in particular.

The issue of a comprehensive test ban cannot be seen in isolation. Nuclear testing is an essential component of a policy whereby nuclear weapons are relied upon to prevent all wars, not just a nuclear war. The implication of this policy is, therefore, that prior to nuclear testing being reduced and eventually banned, a political situation must have come about in which the risk of war is very drastically reduced.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

The Alliance to which the Netherlands belongs is a defensive one. It will never, in any circumstances, be the first to use force. Its goal remains lasting peace in Europe. In that context, I refer to the Alliance's new strategic concept as agreed to by heads of State or Government participating in the Rome meeting of 7 and 8 November, 1991. That new concept reflects the dramatic changes in the political landscape in Europe.

Overall, in the East-West context, further major developments of truly historic dimensions are going on. One of the consequences of these developments is and will increasingly be a reduced reliance on nuclear weapons.

I need not go into detail. I will just mention the Treaty between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of their Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles - the INF Treaty - the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), confidence- and security-building measures and further conventional reductions.

Not only are conventional forces being reduced, but the transparency of military activities in Europe is being sharply enhanced. Now that the Threshold Test Ban Treaty and the Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaties with their appertaining verification protocols have entered into force, it is necessary to look ahead to further implementation by the United States and the USSR of their bilateral process of limiting nuclear tests.

The radical reductions of nuclear weapons which have already been agreed and are in the offing should be incorporated into our approach towards the negotiations on limiting nuclear tests. We really hope that the negotiations between the United States and the USSR on further intermediate limitations of

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

nuclear tests will resume as soon as possible. Further restrictions on the level and numbers of tests to a minimum level along the road to further reducing nuclear weapons and reliance on those weapons in the strategy of deterrence will signify meaningful progress on the way to a comprehensive test ban at the appropriate moment.

A step-by-step approach to reach these goals remains the only practicable one. Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4 does not properly reflect this fact.

Because of its recognition of the validity of the step-by-step approach, the Netherlands considers further work on various interrelated test-ban issues in the Conference on Disarmament to be necessary and essential. There is still a lot of substantial work to be done in the Conference on Disarmament. For example, on the issue of verification and compliance and on other elements concerning a nuclear-test ban, we welcome the work already achieved in the Ad Hoc Committee on Nuclear Testing of the Conference on Disarmament. We hope that that work will continue soon, early in 1992, when the Conference on Disarmament will start its work again. In this regard, the Netherlands does not subscribe to the thought enshrined in operative paragraph 3 of A/C.1/46/L.4, linking the work in the Conference on Disarmament to the negotiation of a comprehensive test ban under an appropriate mandate.

(Mr. Wagenmakers, Netherlands)

While recognizing that a comprehensive test ban remains fully valid as an essential objective, my delegation is convinced that it must be addressed as part of the disarmament process. A comprehensive test ban cannot be approached in isolation. That, in essence, is the problem we have with draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, on the Amendment Conference, in both conceptual and organizational terms. As I just stated, such a ban would require a considerable amount of prior substantive work. The Amendment Conference was convened by the Depositary Governments in accordance with article II of the limited test-ban Treaty, and took place from 7 to 18 January 1991. The three depositaries have thus fulfilled their obligation under that article.

The Netherlands regards the limited test-ban Treaty as an eminently important arms-control instrument, the integrity of which must not be affected. For that reason we cannot support the conceptualization followed in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28 which envisages a perennialization of these specific amendment efforts. Such a permanent process based on singling out the test ban will, in our view, not bear fruit and therefore cannot be conducive to the goal we all seek.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): I wish to explain Finland's abstention in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". Finland continues to believe that the use of nuclear weapons would pose a grave threat to international peace and security, and that nuclear weapons therefore should not be used. At the same time we realize that the dramatic changes in international relations over the past few years have created new opportunities to ensure that they will indeed not be used.

(Mr. Patokallio, Finland)

The disappearance of East-West confrontation has for all practical purposes removed the one scenario that in a crisis could have involved the use of nuclear weapons on a global scale. Intensified efforts to strengthen international non-proliferation arrangements will also help create conditions in which the emergence, and therefore the potential use, of nuclear weapons is precluded. We also realize that the repeated calls in draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.20 and its predecessors for the commencement of negotiations on a legally binding instrument to prohibit the use of nuclear weapons have not been answered, and there seems to be little prospect that they will be answered in the future.

It is for all those reasons that Finland decided it could no longer support this draft resolution.

Mr. DUBUISSON (Belgium) (interpretation from French): My delegation has just voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4, "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", introduced by New Zealand. We want to voice our support for the intensive consultations that made it possible this year to submit a single draft text on this subject.

But rationalization may have been achieved at the cost of clarity, and my delegation wishes to restate the Belgian position on this subject. We attach vital importance to putting an end to nuclear tests; this goes to the very heart of international stability and security. Our objective is a complete and verifiable end to nuclear testing, but in the broader context of disarmament and as a gradual process. Recent developments and initiatives demonstrate an irreversible commitment to such a process.

(Mr. Dubuisson, Belgium)

Similarly, the re-establishment by the Conference on Disarmament of its Ad Hoc Committee under the item entitled "Nuclear test ban" was a step in the right direction. Its current mandate has already enabled it to tackle some essential points, including the scope of the ban and its verification, and to clarify the positions of the parties. The dialogue should continue on the same basis, because a great deal remains to be done to lay a solid foundation for future negotiations. It is premature at this stage, however, to think about beginning those negotiations. Divergent approaches and ambiguities remain as stumbling blocks in the way of a serious process of negotiation.

That is why my delegation favours re-establishing the Ad Hoc Committee at the 1992 session of the Conference on Disarmament on the item "Nuclear test ban" on the basis of the same mandate that governed its work at the 1991 session. It is in that way that we view paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.4.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN (Australia): It was with regret that Australia abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28 on the Amendment Conference for the partial test-ban Treaty. As delegations are aware, Australia attaches the greatest importance to the achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The Committee voted earlier this morning on a draft resolution on this question, among whose sponsors was Australia. We are very pleased with the broad support that draft resolution commanded.

We were obliged nevertheless to abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.28, not least because Australia continues to believe that the Conference on Disarmament is the appropriate forum in which to negotiate a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

(Mr. O'Sullivan, Australia)

Notwithstanding that, Australia appreciates greatly the efforts of the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, Mr. Alatas, in his consultations, which we hope will contribute to the early achievement of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The CHAIRMAN: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 4, I shall call on the representative of Pakistan to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30.

Mr. KAMAL (Pakistan): It is my privilege to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30, sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

The world is witnessing historic developments in the field of disarmament. The new international political landscape, characterized by the end of ideological confrontation, has engendered sanguine expectations. Yet, against this backdrop, tensions caused by regional disputes and conflicts continue to cast a shadow and endanger regional and international peace and security. The increasing importance and relevance of our proposal for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia cannot, therefore, be over-emphasized.

Unwavering in their commitment to the universal elimination of nuclear weapons, the sponsors of the draft resolution remain convinced that until the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free world has been realized it would be advantageous to keep as many regions as possible free of nuclear weapons.

The importance of the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world has been recognized by the General Assembly, at its tenth special session, as well as by the non-aligned countries at their ninth summit conference, held in Belgrade in 1989.

The sponsors believe that the shared goal of universal nuclear disarmament would receive an impetus from the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones are not an end in themselves. Nor are they meant as a substitute for, but, rather, as a complement to, the global and

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

comprehensive approach to nuclear disarmament. They also serve as a vital confidence-building measure in the context of regional disarmament.

We believe that the necessary conditions exist in South Asia to enable the countries of the region to move towards the objective of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. All countries of the region share the commitment to keep the area free of nuclear weapons. They have made unilateral declarations, at the highest levels, pledging themselves not to acquire, develop or manufacture nuclear weapons.

It is our sincere belief that the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone would be the most effective means of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons in our region, with all States of the region accepting equal and non-discriminatory obligations.

Pakistan has time and again reiterated its commitment not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons and to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes only. Over the years Pakistan has made a series of proposals designed to keep South Asia free of nuclear weapons.

On 6 June this year the Prime Minister of Pakistan proposed specifically that the United States, the Soviet Union and China consult with India and Pakistan with a view to evolving equitable and non-discriminatory arrangements to ensure nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia. This forward-looking proposal reflects our genuine desire that the South Asian countries should concentrate their efforts on economic development through the diversion to developmental purposes of resources currently allocated to defence.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, has been prepared on the same lines as

(Mr. Kamal, Pakistan)

resolution 45/53 adopted with the overwhelming support of the States Members of the United Nations last year. It is our earnest and sincere hope that the adoption of the draft resolution will provide further encouragement to the States in our region to move towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. We therefore hope that the international community will lend its broad support once again to the draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. SHAH (India): The Indian delegation has asked to speak in order to give its view on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30.

It is practically the same as resolution 45/53 of 4 December 1990. In fact, the thrust of the resolution has not changed much in the more than 15 years since it was first introduced.

India has expressed its reservations on the idea repeatedly and forcefully in the United Nations. India's position is well known and based on certain principles which determine our disarmament policy. Nuclear disarmament is a global issue and must be solved globally. It is not a regional issue. The goal of nuclear disarmament leading to general and complete disarmament cannot be achieved by partial measures. We have never considered the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as being in accord with a global approach. In fact, the global reach of nuclear weapons and their deployment and stationing in different parts of the globe render nuclear-weapon-free zones less than effective in promoting global nuclear disarmament.

My delegation is aware that the United Nations has endorsed nuclear-weapon-free zones in some other parts of the world. We must remember that the United Nations endorsed them only after a proper definition of the region had been arrived at, based on the correct perception of its geographical extent and after taking into account the full range of the security concerns of the concerned States.

Prior consulations among concerned States and their full participation are some of the essential prerequisites of any regional arrangement. Where these prerequisites are lacking, where there is an artificial definition of a region and where no consensus exists, endorsement of a proposal of this nature by the Committee would be meaningless. My delegation is not aware of any

(Mr. Shah, India)

efforts by the sponsors to undertake prior consultations among all concerned States in the geographical region of India's security concerns.

My delegation considers this draft resolution as one of those hardy rituals in the First Committee which serve no real disarmament purpose. My delegation will therefore vote against draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30.

Mr. PEERTHUM (Mauritius): Since my delegation is speaking for the first time, allow me to join previous speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the Committee.

I have asked to speak in order to state the following in explanation of vote before the voting on the draft resolution (A/C.1/46/L.30) we are now considering on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

The circumstances now prevailing on the international scene dictate that Mauritius explain the way it will vote on this draft resolution. In fact, Mauritius had decided to maintain the position it had taken in recent years on the question of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. But then Mauritius is equally alive to the fact that a number of drastic changes have taken place in the world in the political, military and indeed nuclear fields. In that context, I should like to underline the ending of the cold war, the far-reaching pronouncements made by the United States and the USSR on the reduction of their nuclear-arms arsenals, and the decision of France and China to join the nuclear non-proliferation Treaty, which itself will come up for review in 1995.

All this augurs well for the future, and, should the trend continue, it will mean a lesser need for countries to maintain traditional positions on matters of regional and global security. Bearing all this in mind, Mauritius may therefore review its position on such issues in future as circumstances necessitate.

(Mr. Peerthum, Mauritius)

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30 is sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan and was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 33rd meeting of the First Committee on 11 November 1991.

The CHAIRMAN: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Albania, Angola, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Zaire, Zimbabwe

Against: Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Cuba, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Grenada, Iceland, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mongolia, Myanmar, Norway, Republic of Korea, Sweden, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30 was adopted by 104 votes to 3, with 25 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote.

Mr. STELZER (Austria): Austria would like to refer draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30.

Austria has always welcomed and supported the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Its emphasis on regional approaches is based on its understanding that complex disarmament issues have to be addressed on corresponding levels. Thus regional problems or regional aspects of global issues should be dealt with in a regional or even subregional context.

Austria, however, recognizes that a few preconditions have to be met before the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone can be supported by a General Assembly resolution. The most important of those preconditions is the support of the relevant initiative by all countries of the respective region. Since the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia meets the continued opposition of countries concerned, Austria decided to abstain.

Mr. KRASULIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet Union is a tireless advocate of establishing nuclear-free zones in various areas of the world, as such action serves as an important contribution to the establishment and strengthening of regional systems of security and cooperation. Strengthening the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons also helps in solving the problem of gradually reducing nuclear arsenals, with the ultimate goal of eliminating them completely. We understand that in each specific case, the establishment of such zones should strictly correspond to the situation in the area concerned and should reflect the interests of all the States involved.

With regard to the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in South Asia, we have advocated drawing up a draft resolution acceptable to all countries of the region, for adoption by the General Assembly. We felt and we continue to feel that this problem should become a subject for consultation by the parties concerned. The draft resolution just adopted - as it now stands - does not run counter to the aforementioned principle.

Mr. LEDOGAR (United States of America): The United States delegation joined again this year in support of the traditional resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia (A/C.1/46/L.30). However, the United States would like to make two points in explanation of its vote. First, we trust that all States in the region will take particular note of operative paragraph 2, in which all those States are urged, while working to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone, to refrain, in the meantime, from actions contrary to that objective. Secondly, our delegation also wishes to note that the reference in the third preambular paragraph to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in other regions

(Mr. Ledogar, United States)

of the world, does not constitute a blanket endorsement by the United States of such zones on a universal basis.

Mr. HYLTENIUS (Sweden): Sweden has on several occasions expressed its positive attitude with regard to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. Such zones could promote confidence-building and have a positive influence on the political atmosphere and on security in the region. The establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone requires that the States in the zone should not possess nuclear weapons. Moreover, such States should not deploy nuclear weapons within their territory. Another essential element is the commitment taken by the nuclear-weapon States not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against targets within the zone.

As to concrete proposals concerning such zones, one basic prerequisite must be acceptance and cooperation with regard to the zone initiative on the part of all States in the region. In line with this principle, Sweden has had to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30 regarding the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as the States concerned voted against the draft resolution.

Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland): I have asked to speak to explain the vote of Finland on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". We voted in favour of the draft resolution, because, in general, Finland supports efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones. However, we consider that the process of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in any region should enjoy the support of all the States concerned.

Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea): I have asked to speak so as to explain our vote with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30. In accordance with the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly and the

(Mr. Lee, Republic of Korea)

Final Declaration of the Third Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone should take into account the specific conditions and characteristics of the regions concerned and should be based on arrangements freely arrived at by the States of the region. My delegation abstained in the vote on the draft resolution in view of the fact that there is no consensus among the countries in the region.

Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30, concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, which the Committee has just adopted.

The Indonesian position regarding the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known. Indonesia, together with other countries in the Association of South-East Asian Nations, is continuing to make efforts towards promoting the establishment of South-East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. In paragraphs 33 and 60 of that document, the General Assembly declared that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the zone concerned constituted an important disarmament measure. In paragraph 61, the General Assembly further stated that the process of establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged, and that the States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements establishing the nuclear-weapon-free zones.

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

In view of the fact that efforts towards the achievement of an agreement on the issue are still to be conclusively pursued, my delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) (interpretation from Spanish): Costa Rica voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", because it has traditionally given its support to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in the various parts of the world where there have been proposals in this regard.

This position began, naturally, with our firm support for the Treaty of Tlatelolco, establishing the first nuclear-weapon-free zone in Latin America. We have always been guided by this criterion in supporting the various initiatives for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other regions.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine) (interpretation from Russian): The Ukrainian delegation voted for draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.30 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. In this way, we wanted as clearly as possible to express our consistent support of principle for any efforts to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons, both at the global and at the regional level, and our support for the initiative taken by States in adopting such measures in any region.

The result of taking such initiatives has inevitably been the strengthening of security in the region and of cooperation between States. As we have said before, we believe that such measures for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones can only be successfully put into effect with the voluntary concerned participation of all States in the particular region, as well as that of interested influential States whose participation is welcomed by the States of the region.

The CHAIRMAN: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution listed in cluster 5.

The Committee will first take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.16.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.16 has 45 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Australia at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the

(Mr. Kheradi)

Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Singapore, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Viet Nam and Yugoslavia.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.16 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.16 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36 has 47 sponsors and was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 30th meeting of the First Committee, on 7 November 1991. The list of sponsors is as follows: Afghanistan, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

The CHAIRMAN: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36 have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.36 was adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Korea on a point of order.

Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea): I wish to confirm that our delegation is listed as a sponsor of the draft resolution which has just been adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: The statement of the representative of the Republic of Korea will be reflected in the official records of the Committee.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions on all the draft resolutions in cluster 5.

Mr. MORADI (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation appreciates the efforts of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/46/L.16, entitled "Chemical and bacteriological (biological) weapons: measures to uphold the authority of the 1925 Geneva Protocol". However, my delegation wishes to go on record on the following points:

First, we believe that the fourth preambular paragraph should have deplored the use and the threat of use of chemical weapons.

Secondly, we are of the view that in the last part of paragraph 3 there should have been a reference to removing the use and the threat of use of chemical weapons.

Thirdly, our understanding with regard to paragraph 4 is that the activities of regional and international disarmament conferences and parallel decisions by national Governments, also aimed at hastening the conclusion of the chemical weapons convention, must be in complete conformity with the decisions of the Conference on Disarmament and the draft of that convention.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.